UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,613	03/02/2000	Thiru Srinivasan	1642(42059-01010)	4139

25231 7590 09/19/2005

MARSH, FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP
3151 SOUTH VAUGHN WAY
SUITE 411
AURORA, CO 80014

EXAMINER	
ENGLAND, DAVID E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/517,613	SRINIVASAN, THIRU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E. England	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 – 14 and 16 – 21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 – 14 and 16 – 21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 March 2000* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 21 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "said scheduler is further configured to receive a second list created by an entity in the data network, different than said website searched for said multimedia file, said second list including an identifier of a multimedia file from said entity in the data network and wherein said scheduler is also configured to receive a schedule, created by said entity in the data network, of the availability of said multimedia file from said entity in the data network" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an

application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 8 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The act of storing a multimedia file is taught in claim 6 which claim 8 is dependent on.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not describe the limitation of, "said scheduler is further configured to receive a second list created by an entity in the data network, different than said website searched for said multimedia file, said second list including an identifier of a multimedia file from said entity in the data network and wherein said scheduler is also configured to receive a schedule, created by said entity in the data network, of the availability of said multimedia file from said entity in the data network", assuming that the entity has a first and a second list. Applicant is asked to point out in the specification and drawings where in a second list is created. If no explanation is given, then the Examiner will assume that the Applicant means to have the scheduler on multiple devices which can access a web site for different multimedia at the same time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liu U.S. Patent No. 5953005.

8. Referencing claim 1, Dwek teaches a system for automatically retrieving and playing multimedia files, comprising:

9. a network access interface through which access to a data network may be attained, (e.g., 4, lines 25 – 59);

10. a processing module configured to search the data network for a first multimedia file and to return information including an identifier of said first multimedia file, a location of said first multimedia file and a datum relating to a schedule of the availability of said multimedia file, wherein said processing module is further configured to categorize said first multimedia file and create categorization information relating to said first multimedia file, (e.g., col. 6, lines 15 – 52);

11. a selection interface in communication with said processing module which provides for presentation of the returned information, and is configured to receive and process a selection for accessing a selected multimedia file from the data network and compile a download schedule, (e.g., col. 6, lines 15 – 52);

12. a file download device in communication with the selection interface which, based on the download schedule, automatically accesses said first multimedia file at said location through said network access interface and downloads the selected multimedia file, (e.g., col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 30).

13. As per claim 2, Dwek teaches including a centralized location on the data network employable to search the data network for a second multimedia file, receive information including an identifier of said second multimedia file, a location of said second multimedia file, a datum relating to a schedule of availability of said second multimedia file and categorization

information relating to said second multimedia file, and provide said information to the processing module, (e.g., col. 4, lines 16 – 43 & col. 8, lines 26 – 67).

14. Referencing claim 3, Dwek teaches the data network is the Internet, (e.g., Abstract et seq.)

15. Referencing claim 4, Dwek teaches the interface, processing module, selection interface, and download device are configured on a personal computer, (e.g., col. 3, lines 40 – 56).

16. Referencing claim 5, Dwek teaches at least one of: the processing module, the selection interface, and the file download device are configured as plugins in a web browser installed in the personal computer, (e.g., col. 2, line 41 – col. 3, line 9 & col. 4, lines 16 – 43).

17. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Dwek teaches the selection interface includes at least one of:

18. a first selection for real time play of said first multimedia file which is downloaded, (e.g., col. 4, line 53 – col. 5, line 25);

19. a second selection for storing in a memory said first multimedia file which is downloaded in memory, (e.g., col. 4, line 53 – col. 5, line 25).

20. Referencing claim 7, Dwek teaches an interface is provided for restricting categories of multimedia files to be presented by the selection interface, (e.g., col. 7, lines 31 – 50)

21. Referencing claim 8, Dwek teaches a memory to which said first multimedia file may be downloaded, (e.g., col. 4, line 53 – col. 5, line 25).

22. Referencing claim 9, Dwek teaches the system includes a media player for playing said first multimedia file in real time, (e.g., col. 4, line 53 – col. 5, line 25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dwek in view of Leeke et al. (6587127) (hereinafter Leeke).

25. Referencing claim 10, Dwek teaches a method of retrieving multimedia files over a data network from a remote site in connection with the data network, comprising the steps of:

26. providing a central processor for searching a multimedia website for a multimedia file and a schedule of the availability of said multimedia file, categorizing said multimedia file, and creating a listing containing information relating to said multimedia file, (e.g., col. 4, lines 34 – 62);

27. presenting an interactive interface which includes the listing and through which individual selections may be made for downloading the multimedia files from the at least one multimedia website, (e.g., col. 6, lines 15 – 52);

28. receiving an input through the interactive interface selecting a particular number of the multimedia files from the listing, (e.g., col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 30);

29. compiling a download schedule based on the received input, wherein the schedule includes a description of the multimedia file selected, time for the download, and download information, (e.g., col. 9, lines 12 – 45);

30. based on the input received through the interface, accessing and downloading over the data network, the selected multimedia files from the selected remote sites, (e.g., col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 30), but does not specifically teach the schedule including day and time for the download. Leeke teaches compiling a download schedule based on the received input, wherein the schedule includes a description of the multimedia file selected, day and time for the download, and download information, (e.g. col. 19, line 66 – col. 20, line 42 & col. 14, lines 52 – 63 & col.15, lines 18 – 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Leeke with Dwek so a user can view when a multimedia file was downloaded exactly or when a multimedia will be downloaded so the user can select future multimedia to download at a specific time.

31. Referencing claim 13, Dwek teaches the multimedia files are retrieved according to a time schedule, (e.g. col. 9, lines 13 – 30).

32. As per claim 21, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Dwek teaches said scheduler is further configured to receive a second list created by an entity in the data network, different than said website searched for said multimedia file, said second list including an identifier of a multimedia file from said entity in the data network and wherein said scheduler is also configured to receive a schedule, created by said entity in the data network, of the availability of said multimedia file from said entity in the data network, (e.g., col. 9, lines 18 – 57).

33. Claims 11, 14, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

34. Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dwek and Leeke as applied to claims 10 and 11 above, and in further view of Martino (5987103).

35. As per claim 12, Dwek and Leeke do not specifically teach only a predetermined number of multimedia files may be stored in memory. Martino teaches only a predetermined number of multimedia files may be stored in memory, (e.g. col. 9, lines 39 – 67). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Martino with the combine system of Dwek and Leeke because it would be more efficient if there was a predetermined number of multimedia files stored because it could free up space to allocate of other files that my require more memory then other multimedia files.

36. As per claim 19, Dwek and Leeke teaches the listing is created and transmitted as disclosed above, but does not specifically teach the listing is created and transmitted

automatically on a periodic basis. Martino teaches the listing is created and transmitted automatically on a periodic basis, (e.g. col. 10, lines 27 – 38). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Martino with the combine system of Dwek and Leeke because it would be more convenient for the system to automatically create and transmit the list so to save time and to automatically update any files that are old.

37. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dwek and Leeke as applied to claims 10 and 13 above, and in further view of Ten Kate et al. (6601237) (hereinafter Ten Kate).

38. Referencing claim 16, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Dwek and Leeke do not specifically teach any scheduling conflicts between the downloading of multimedia files are detected and the downloading is rescheduled as necessary to resolve conflicts. Ten Kate teaches any scheduling conflicts between the downloading of multimedia files are detected and the downloading is rescheduled as necessary to resolve conflicts, (e.g. col. 6, lines 32 – 46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Ten Kate with the combine system of Dwek and Leeke because if more than one multimedia is desired at the same time but only one can be obtained at a time it would be advantageous for a system to reschedule a transmission of a multimedia file that a user would desire so the user is able to receive what was requested without having to re-request for the multimedia file.

Second Office Action

39. Claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 21 are presented again for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

40. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

41. Referencing claim 1, Liu teaches a system for automatically retrieving and playing multimedia files, comprising:

42. a network access interface through which access to a data network may be attained, (e.g., Fig. 1 & col. 3, lines 35 – 64);

43. a processing module configured to search the data network for a first multimedia file and to return information including an identifier of said first multimedia file, a location of said first multimedia file and a datum relating to a schedule of the availability of said multimedia file, wherein said processing module is further configured to categorize said first multimedia file and create categorization information relating to said first multimedia file, (e.g., col. 6, line 28 – col. 7, line 3);

44. a selection interface in communication with said processing module which provides for presentation of the returned information, and is configured to receive and process a selection for

accessing a selected multimedia file from the data network and compile a download schedule, (e.g., Fig. 2 & col. 6, line 28 – col. 7, line 3);

45. a file download device in communication with the selection interface which, based on the download schedule, automatically accesses said first multimedia file at said location through said network access interface and downloads the selected multimedia file, (e.g., col. 2, lines 34 – 60 & col. 3, line 65 – 19).

46. As per claim 2, Liu teaches including a centralized location on the data network employable to search the data network for a second multimedia file, receive information including an identifier of said second multimedia file, a location of said second multimedia file, a datum relating to a schedule of availability of said second multimedia file and categorization information relating to said second multimedia file, and provide said information to the processing module, (e.g., col. 3, lines 34 – 64 & col. 6, line 28 – col. 7, line 3).

47. Referencing claim 3, Liu teaches the data network is the Internet, (e.g., col. 8, lines 20 – 33).

48. Referencing claim 4, Liu teaches the interface, processing module, selection interface, and download device are configured on a personal computer, (e.g., col. 3, lines 53 – 64).

49. Referencing claim 5, Liu teaches at least one of: the processing module, the selection interface, and the file download device are configured as plugins in a web browser installed in the personal computer, (e.g., col. 4, lines 34 – 62).

50. Referencing claim 8, Liu teaches a memory to which said first multimedia file may be downloaded, (e.g., col. 6, lines 28 – 50).

51. Referencing claim 9, Liu teaches the system includes a media player for playing said first multimedia file in real time, (e.g., Fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

52. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

53. Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Leeke et al. (6587127) (hereinafter Leeke).

54. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Liu teaches the selection interface includes at least one of:

55. a second selection for storing in a memory said first multimedia file which is downloaded in memory, (e.g., col. 6, lines 28 – 50), but does not specifically teach a first selection for real time play of said first multimedia file which is downloaded. Leeke teaches a first selection for real time play of said first multimedia file which is downloaded, (e.g., col. 5, lines 1 – 48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Leeke with Liu because real time play or "streaming" enables a user to download a multimedia file while listening to there choice without permanently downloading the multimedia file to their hard-drive, (i.e. RAM instead of disc space). Therefore saving space on the user's hard-drive and also giving the user the option to experience the multimedia file before dedicating resources to the permanent download of the multimedia file.

56. Referencing claim 7, Liu teaches an interface is provided for selecting from which the listing is created as described above, but does not specifically teach selecting from categories. Leeke teaches an interface is provided for selecting categories from which the listing is created, (e.g. col. 19, line 66 – col. 20, line 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Leeke with Liu because utilizing categories could enable a user to view specific types of music that they would be more interested in and negate most of the music that would be of no interest to the user, (example, viewing or listing only Heavy Metal instead of Rap).

57. Referencing claim 10, Liu teaches a method of retrieving multimedia files over a data network from a remote site in connection with the data network, comprising the steps of:

58. providing a central processor for searching a multimedia website for a multimedia file and a schedule of the availability of said multimedia file, categorizing said multimedia file, and creating a listing containing information relating to said multimedia file, (e.g., col. 4, lines 34 – 62);

59. presenting an interactive interface which includes the listing and through which individual selections may be made for downloading the multimedia files from the at least one multimedia website, (e.g., Fig. 2 & col. 6, line 28 – col. 7, line 3);

60. receiving an input through the interactive interface selecting a particular number of the multimedia files from the listing, (e.g., col. 2, lines 34 – 60 & col. 3, line 65 – 19);

61. compiling a download schedule based on the received input, wherein the schedule includes a description of the multimedia file selected, day and time for the download, and download information, (e.g., Abstract et seq.);

62. based on the input received through the interface, accessing and downloading over the data network, the selected multimedia files from the selected remote sites, (e.g., col. 2, lines 34 – 60 & col. 3, line 65 – 19), but does not specifically teach the schedule including day and time for the download. Leeke teaches compiling a download schedule based on the received input, wherein the schedule includes a description of the multimedia file selected, day and time for the download, and download information, (e.g. col. 19, line 66 – col. 20, line 42 & col. 14, lines 52 – 63 & col.15, lines 18 – 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Leeke with Liu so a user can view when a multimedia file was downloaded exactly or when a multimedia will be downloaded so the user can select future multimedia to download at a specific time.

63. Referencing claim 13, Liu does not specifically teach the multimedia files are retrieved according to a time schedule. Leeke teaches the multimedia files are retrieved according to a time schedule, (e.g. col. 14, line 52 – col. 15, line 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Leeke with Liu because of similar reasons stated above.

64. As per claim 21, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Liu teaches said scheduler is further configured to receive a second list created by an entity in the data network, different than said website searched for said multimedia file, said second list including an identifier of a multimedia file from said entity in the data network and wherein said scheduler is also configured to receive a schedule, created by said entity in the data network, of the availability of said multimedia file from said entity in the data network, (e.g., col. 3, lines 35 – 64 et seq. (the scheduler can be on more than one device or "entity", which can search of a completely different list of multimedia files).

65. Claims 11, 14, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

66. Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu and Leeke as applied to claims 10 and 11 above, and in further view of Martino (5987103).

67. As per claim 12, Liu and Leeke do not specifically teach only a predetermined number of multimedia files may be stored in memory. Martino teaches only a predetermined number of multimedia files may be stored in memory, (e.g. col. 9, lines 39 – 67). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Martino with the combine system of Liu and Leeke because it would be more efficient if there was a predetermined number of multimedia files stored because it could free up space to allocate of other files that my require more memory then other multimedia files.

68. As per claim 19, Liu and Leeke teaches the listing is created and transmitted as disclosed above, but does not specifically teach the listing is created and transmitted automatically on a periodic basis. Martino teaches the listing is created and transmitted automatically on a periodic basis, (e.g. col. 10, lines 27 – 38). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Martino with the combine system of Liu and Leeke because it would be more convenient for the system to automatically create and transmit the list so to save time and to automatically update any files that are old.

69. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu and Leeke as applied to claims 10 and 13 above, and in further view of Ten Kate et al. (6601237) (hereinafter Ten Kate).

70. Referencing claim 16, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Liu and Leeke do not specifically teach any scheduling conflicts between the downloading of multimedia files are

detected and the downloading is rescheduled as necessary to resolve conflicts. Ten Kate teaches any scheduling conflicts between the downloading of multimedia files are detected and the downloading is rescheduled as necessary to resolve conflicts, (e.g. col. 6, lines 32 – 46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Ten Kate with the combine system of Liu and Leeke because if more than one multimedia is desired at the same time but only one can be obtained at a time it would be advantageous for a system to reschedule a transmission of a multimedia file that a user would desire so the user is able to receive what was requested without having to re-request for the multimedia file.

Conclusion

71. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

72. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

73. a. Fanning et al. U.S. Patent No. 6366907 discloses Real-time search engine.

74. b. Herz U.S. Patent No. 6029195 discloses System for customized electronic identification of desirable objects.

75. c. Logan et al. U.S. Patent No. 5732216 discloses Audio message exchange system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De DE